

NOTE FOR: JMM

It is recommended that you sign the attached letter to OMB supporting Defense Dept.'s position on a report requested by Chairman Hebert on a sense of the Congress resolution which has been referred to his Committee.

The resolution was introduced by Sikes (D., Fla.), who is the No. 2 Democrat on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and was sparked by the Pueblo and EC-121 incidents.

DOD's position generally favors the proposition that there ought to be adequate protection for manned Armed Forces ships or planes on intelligence gathering missions, but quite correctly points out that it is impossible to prevent attacks by determined foreign forces on lawful peacetime intelligence missions and recommends that the resolution be reworded to focus on the need to minimize the risks and effects of such attacks.

I've coordinated with all bases (NIPE, OGC, DDP, DDS&T) and their general view is that we have no objection to the proposed report.

As you know, even if enacted the resolution has no legal effect. Buzhardt, in DOD, told [REDACTED] that his letter favoring the resolution is merely a public relations job.

You might want to mention this item to Col. White and/or the Director. [REDACTED]

STATINTL .

25X1A

25X1A

2 JUL 1971

Mr. J. F. C. Hyde, Jr.
Office of Assistant Director
for Legislative Reference
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D. C. 20503

Dear Mr. Hyde:

This is in response to your request for our views on the Department of Defense's report on H. Con. Res. 79, "Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the protection that should be provided ships and planes of the Armed Forces of the United States sent on intelligence gathering missions."

The Central Intelligence Agency has no objections to the proposed report.

Sincerely,



John M. Maury
Legislative Counsel

STATINTL !

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - Adse

✓ 1 - Subj

1 - Chrn

OLC/LLM:smg (30 June '71)